

# Indiana Department of Education



Peggy Wild, PhD, CFCS, State Specialist  
Family and Consumer Sciences Education  
Room 229, State House - Indianapolis, IN 46204-2798  
Office Location: 151 West Ohio Street, Indianapolis

Date: August 30, 2002

To: Judy Miller, Indiana Professional Standards Board

Re: Request for Family and Consumer Sciences Modifications to Standards for Beginning Teachers of Career and Technical Education

The Family and Consumer Sciences (FACS) Teacher Education Council is comprised of representatives of the three universities in Indiana that have Family and Consumer Sciences teacher education programs (Ball State, Indiana State, and Purdue,) middle level and high school level family and consumer sciences teachers, vocational administrators, business and industry, and the Indiana Department of Education.

In the fall of 2001, the Family and Consumer Sciences Teacher Education Council identified the need to develop modifications or clarifications for two of the IPSP Standards for Beginning Teachers of Career and Technical Education. In order to complete the standards-based teacher education program alignments for their Unit Assessment Systems, the three university representatives all needed to define the academic content standards (Standard #2) and the instructional strategies (Standard #4) their students need to master. Rather than working separately, they requested that the FACS Teacher Education Council undertake this work.

During the spring of 2002, the FACS Teacher Education Council contacted the Family and Consumer Sciences Education State Administrators from all other states and requested that they provide their state's beginning teacher standards for academic content and instructional strategies. Twenty states replied, with fifteen states having standards that they could share. Those standards were examined and used to create an initial compendium that was reviewed by the Council and other interested parties. The compendium was refined through a variety of processes by work groups throughout the state and formatted to fit the Standards for Beginning Teachers of Career and Technical Education, specifically as appendices to Standards #2 and #4. The FACS Teacher Education Council accepted these appendices in June 2002 as guiding documents for the FACS teacher education programs in all three universities and recommended that they be presented to the Indiana Professional Standards Board Standards Committee for consideration.

The Council requests that the IPSB Standards Committee consider incorporating these two appendices as family and consumer sciences modifications or clarifications to Standards #2 and #4 of the Indiana Standards for Beginning Teachers of Career and Technical Education. Such consideration would facilitate the statewide use of these standards for preservice, inservice, and licensing purposes.

# **Business Education Advisory Group Edit Team**

## **Action Report: Standards Revisions Resulting From Public Comment**

**June 12, 2002**  
(Revised September 16, 2002)

## Introduction

On Tuesday, April 2, 2002, universities, stakeholders, and individuals across the state of Indiana received an electronic copy of the newly developed Business Education standards, a survey, and a memorandum requesting feedback and responses to the survey. The deadline for submitting surveys and written comments was May 1, 2002. On May 2, 2002, the total responses received via fax, mail and electronic mail totaled seventeen (17). The seventeen (17) responses can be broken down accordingly: six (6) from educators at the senior high level, three (3) from educators at the junior high/middle school level, four (4) from school corporations' district offices, one (1) from the business community, one (1) from an education center, one (1) from a university, and one (1) from an unidentified respondent.

The edit team met together on June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2002, to discuss the responses to the survey and to consider the additional public comments. Based on the feedback collected, and the overall general consensus of the drafted standards document, the edit team made minimal revisions. Below is a list of the survey questions along with a summary of responses according to the Likert Scale.

<b>Question Number</b>	<b>Strongly Agree (5)</b>	<b>Agree (4)</b>	<b>Undecided (3)</b>	<b>Disagree (2)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Variance</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
#1	The standards are written in a clear, understandable manner.								
	10	7				17	4.588	.47	.69
#2	The standards are sensitive to ethnic & cultural diversity.								
	9	6	2			17	4.412	.51	.71
#3	The standards are gender neutral.								
	15	2				17	4.882	.11	.33
#4	The standards reflect the current knowledge base (i.e., "best practices") available to educators.								
	9	6	2			17	4.412	.52	.71
#5	There are important related ideas that are NOT covered by these standards.								
		2	5	5	5	17	2.235	1.06	1.03
#6	Some of the standards are redundant.								
		11	1	3	2	17	3.235	.69	.83
#7	The issues addressed in the standards cover the critical concerns of my constituents.								
	3	11	3			17	4.000	.38	.61
#8	The performance statements correlate clearly with the knowledge and disposition statements.								
	6	11				17	4.353	.24	.49
#9	The performances that are described are assessable.								
	4	10	3			17	4.059	.43	.66
#10	The standards are realistic.								
	4	10	2	1		17	4.000	.38	.61

## **Summary of Revisions**

The BEAG edit team reviewed the survey questions which received the most “undecided” or “negative” responses. The questions were addressed as follows:

**Question #5 – There are important related ideas that are NOT covered by these standards.** This was one of two questions stated in the negative; therefore the low mean score of 2.2 can be interpreted as positive. Although there were several who marked “undecided,” and two responders who marked “agree,” there were no written comments or suggestions associated with this specific question for the edit committee’s consideration. The committee determined that the question may have been somewhat confusing but reviewed the standards for any items that may have been left out.

During the review, the edit committee made minor wording changes to the document which included the following:

- Standard 1.13 under “Knowledge,” changed the word “multi-disciplinary” to “cross-disciplinary.” The edit team determined the word “cross-disciplinary” to be more accurate in describing the ties business has to other disciplines.
- Standard 1.7 under “Performance,” included the phrase, “and explains the procedures for alternate input methods.” This change was made based on conversation about the availability of voice recognition technology. Many schools may not have this technology available to them, and since voice technology is a skill that can be acquired easily, the edit committee decided to alter the standards to reflect how one can understand the concepts without experiencing the technology.

Overall, the edit committee believed the standards to be comprehensive and lacking no important related ideas.

**Question #6 – Some of the standards are redundant.**

This is another question for which a low mean score would indicate a strong positive response; however, eleven of the seventeen respondents agreed that some of the standards are redundant. The edit committee determined that the proposed redundant nature of the document may have stemmed from seeing the words “knowledge,” “disposition,” and “performances” repeated under each standard. The edit committee concluded that any existing redundancy is necessary to creating meaningful linkages between the standards and, therefore, not cause for major revision.

**Other** - The edit committee reviewed the few written comments that were received along with the survey responses. Those comments were addressed as follows:

- **Standard 1.7** under “Knowledge,” changed “understands how an entrepreneur starts and maintains a business” to “understands the concepts of entrepreneurship.” This change was made to address one respondent’s concerns that a teacher candidate would need a specific course to address starting and maintaining a business.
- **Question #9** – “Disposition statements will be difficult to assess.” The edit committee reaffirmed that the business education advisory group as a whole recognizes and understands the difficulty in assessing disposition statements, but this comment warranted no further revision to the standards.
- **Question #10** – “Only standard #1 deals with knowledge of ‘business – technology’ content. The other standards deal with knowledge of ‘best’ practice. This will require major changes in preservice programs to prepare future business/technology teachers to meet these standards.” The business education advisory group followed the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) model for creating the standards in which only standard number one deals with subject matter content.

Finally, the edit committee discussed dropping the word “technology” from the title business/technology education. Originally, the title was chosen to align with the Department of Education curriculum design for business; however, an existing set of standards for Technology Education already have been approved by the Indiana Professional Standards Board. In order to prevent confusion, the business education advisory group decided to drop the word “technology” from the title. In addition, the committee discussed the possibility of dropping the word “education” since no other content areas (e.g., Math, English/Language Arts) use the word “education” in referring to their fields of study. The term “business education” refers to the programs provided by colleges and universities to prepare business educators; the term “business” refers to the content area. These standards pertain to what the teacher of the business content area knows, values, and does; therefore, the edit committee recommends changing the title to “Standards for the Teacher of Business.”

## Conclusion

Based on the responses collected, the edit committee concluded that there is a high level of acceptance of the teaching standards for business as written. The standards have undergone minimal revision and remain aligned with the model standards of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium.